UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/536,847	05/31/2005	Maarten Peter Bodlaender	NL 021307	4715

24737 7590 01/06/2009

PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS
P.O. BOX 3001
BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510

EXAMINER	
GOEL, DINESH K	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2419	
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
01/06/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/536,847	BODLAENDER, MAARTEN PETER	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	DINESH GOEL	2419	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *29 September 2008*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-12* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-12* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 8, and 9 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1, 2, 4, 8, and 10-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dunstan (US Publication Number 2003/0061267) in view of Glassen et al (U.S. Patent Number 5,671,441), and further in view of Bays ((U.S. Patent Number 7139242).

Referring to claims 1 and 8, Dustan teaches a method for a first communication device (reads host) of maintaining an up-to-date configuration description of a second communication device, said first device comprises a storage medium and is adapted for storing on said storage medium configuration descriptions being uniquely identified by configuration identifiers (Figure 5, Paragraph 0029), the method comprises the acts of:

receiving from the second device A information comprising a configuration identifier uniquely identifying a configuration of the second device ("515" or "510" in Figure 5, Paragraph 0029),

checking whether a configuration description identified by the received configuration identifier is already stored on the storage medium ("520" in Figure 5, Paragraph 0029),

if said first configuration description is already stored on the storage medium, setting the configuration description corresponding to the received configuration identifier as an active configuration description of the second device ("530" and "535" in Figure 5, Paragraph 0029).

However, Dustan does not teach that if said configuration description identified by the configuration identifier is not stored on the storage medium, requesting and receiving the configuration description specifically from said second device. It only teaches (Paragraph 0031) storing said configuration description together with said configuration identifier on said storage medium and setting the configuration description corresponding to the received configuration identifier as the active configuration description of the second device.

Glassen et al teach (Column 8, Lines 29-33) a method for identifying I/O devices by requesting and receiving the configuration data from the I/O.

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have modified the teaching of Dunstan with the teachings of Glassen et al. The motivation would have been to employ a method so that the configuration and

service data could be obtained directly from the device and would be stored for controlling the device.

Neither Dustan nor Glassen et al teach receiving from the second device a leave message, in response to the leave message, changing the configuration description to inactive without deleting from the storage medium the configuration description corresponding to the configuration identifier.

However, Bays disclose a system and method where configuration description is marked inactive without deleting from a device based on a unique identifier provided by the second device (Column 6 Lines 65-67, Column 7 Lines 9-11).

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have modified the teaching of Dunstan as modified with the teachings of Bays. The motivation would have been to make the process more efficient by not deleting a configuration description but just marking it inactive so that it could be used in future without a need for recreating it.

Referring to claim 2, Glassen et al further teach the method wherein the unique configuration identifier comprises an identification of the second device (Column 3, Lines 41-45, 51-57).

Referring to claim 4, Glassen et al further teach the method wherein the configuration identifier is a device specific configuration number uniquely identifying the configuration of the device (Column 10, Lines 36-39).

Regarding claims 10 and 11, Bays further teaches;

receiving an announcement from the second device including the configuration identifier (Column 6 Lines 44-54, message is received from the device); and

setting active the configuration description stored in the storage medium without downloading the configuration description (Column 6 Lines 44-54).

4. Claim 7 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dunstan (US Publication Number 2003/0061267) in view Glassen et al (U.S. Patent Number 5671441), and further in view of Bays ((U.S. Patent Number 7139242) and Manni et al (U.S. Patent Number 7194689).

Referring to claim 7, Dunstan as modified does not specifically teach the method wherein the first device is a control point in an UPnP network, and the second device is an UPnP device being part of the UPnP network.

However, Manni et al teach where the first device would be a user control point and the second device would be a UPnP device in a UPnP network configuration (Column 7 Lines 42-46).

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have modified the teaching of Dunstan as modified with the teachings of Manni et al. The motivation would have been to use already available UPnP networking

technology to be able to discover various devices, browsing their properties, selecting their services, and controlling them.

Referring to claim 3, Dunstan as modified does not specifically teach the method wherein the configuration description comprises an identification of the services offered by the second device.

However, Manni et al further teach that the configuration description comprises an identification of services offered by the second device (Column 3 Lines 39-49).

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have modified the teaching of Dunstan as modified with the teachings of Manni et al. The motivation would have been to use already available UPnP networking technology to be able to discover various devices, browsing their properties, selecting their services, and controlling them.

5. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dunstan (US Publication Number 2003/0061267) in view of Glassen et al (U.S. Patent Number 5671441), and further in view of Bays ((U.S. Patent Number 7139242) and Mikuriya (U.S. Patent Number 6728633).

Referring to claim 5, Dunstan as modified does not specifically teach a method wherein the configuration descriptions on the storage medium, which have not been accessed for the longest time period, are deleted from the storage medium.

Mikuriya et al teach such a method of deleting the oldest data from the storage device which would also be applied here (Column 15, Lines 18-25).

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have modified the teaching of Dunstan as modified with the teachings of Mikuriya et al. The motivation would have been to provide a method where the old records can be removed from the memory which have not been used for the longest period of time, so that the memory space would be utilized more efficiently.

6. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dunstan (US Publication Number 2003/0061267) in view of Glassen et al (U.S. Patent Number 5671441), and further in view of Bays ((U.S. Patent Number 7139242) and Obrink (International Publication Number WO 00/49944).

Referring to claim 6, Dunstan as modified does not specifically teach the method wherein the second device generates the configuration identifier by deriving it from the configuration description using fingerprinting.

However, Obrink teaches a method of using finger printing and creating digital representation (Page 8 Lines 12-33).

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have modified the teaching of Dunstan as modified with the teachings of Obrink. The motivation would have been to provide a method where finger printing identification would be used to identify a person for access control.

7. Claims 9 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dunstan (US Publication Number 2003/0061267) in view of Manni et al (U.S. Patent Number 7194689), and further in view of Glassen et al (U.S. Patent Number 5671441) and Bays ((U.S. Patent Number 7139242).

Referring to claim 9, Dustan teaches a method for a host communication device for maintaining an up-to-date configuration description of a second communication device, said host comprises a storage medium and is adapted for storing on said storage medium configuration descriptions being uniquely identified by configuration identifiers (Figure 5, Paragraph 0029), the host comprises:

Means for receiving from the second device information comprising a configuration identifier uniquely identifying a configuration of the second device ("515" or "510" in Figure 5, Paragraph 0029),

Means for checking whether the configuration description identified by the received configuration identifier is already stored on the storage medium ("520" in Figure 5, Paragraph 0029),

Means for, if said configuration description is already stored on the storage medium, setting the configuration description corresponding to the received configuration identifier as an active configuration description of the second device ("530" and "535" in Figure 5, Paragraph 0029).

However, Dustan does not teach that the host device is a UPnP control point and the second device is UPnP device.

Manni et al teach (Column 7 Lines 42-46) where the host device would be a user control point and the second device would be a UPnP device in a UPnP network configuration.

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have modified the teaching of Dunstan with the teachings of Manni et al. The motivation would have been to use already available UPnP networking technology to be able to discover various devices, browsing their properties, selecting their services, and controlling them.

Also, Dustan does not specifically teach that if said configuration description identified by the configuration identifier is not stored on the storage medium, requesting and receiving the configuration description from said device (UPnP device as taught by by Manni et al). It only teaches (Paragraph 0031) storing said configuration description together with said configuration identifier on said storage medium and setting the configuration description corresponding to the received configuration identifier as the active configuration description of the second device (taught as UPnP device by Manni et al).

Glassen et al teach a method for identifying I/O devices by requesting and receiving the configuration data from the I/O (Column 8, Lines 29-33).

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have modified the teaching of Dunstan as modified with the teachings of

Glassen et al. The motivation would have been to employ a method so that the configuration and service data could be obtained directly from the device and would be stored for controlling the device.

Further, Dustan as modified does not specifically teach receiving from the second device a leave message, in response to the leave message, changing the configuration description to inactive without deleting from the storage medium the configuration description corresponding to the configuration identifier.

However, Bays disclose a system and method where configuration description is marked inactive without deleting from a device based on a unique identifier provided by the second device (Column 6 Lines 65-67, Column 7 Lines 9-11).

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have modified the teaching of Dunstan as modified with the teachings of Bays. The motivation would have been to make the process more efficient by not deleting a configuration description but just marking it inactive so that it could be used in future without a need for recreating it.

Regarding claim 12, Bays further teaches the device (UPnP device as taught by by Manni et al) further comprising;

means for receiving an announcement from the UPnP device including the configuration identifier (Column 6 Lines 44-54, message is received from the device); and

means for setting active the configuration description stored in the storage medium without downloading the configuration description (Column 6 Lines 44-54).

Conclusion

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DINESH GOEL whose telephone number is (571)270-5201. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:00 AM-5:00 PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Daniel Ryman can be reached on 571-272-3152. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Dinesh Goel/
Examiner, Art Unit 2419

/Daniel J. Ryman/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2419